

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the able minority leader's inquiry, we expect to request to adjourn over upon the announcement of the program for next week.

Monday is District day, and there are eight District bills:

H.R. 13837, to amend Healing Arts Practice Act;

H.R. 12673, to authorize blood banks to transfer blood components;

H.R. 9257, to amend the laws with respect to the parking or storage of motor vehicles;

H.R. 13564, to eliminate straw party deeds in joint tenancies;

H.R. 13565, to validate certain deeds improperly acknowledged or executed; S. 2056, judge's survivors annuity refund;

H.R. 10335, revise District of Columbia's Criminal Code with respect to false pretenses and bad checks; and

H.R. 10336, to provide liens against property of hotel guests.

Also we have H.R. 13950, Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. This has an open rule with 3 hours of general debate.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, a continuing appropriations resolution for fiscal year 1970. Then we continue with consideration of H.R. 13950, the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. Also H.R. 14001, the Selective Service Amendment Act of 1969, which has an open rule with 4 hours of debate.

H.R. 14252, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 4244, pertaining to the Administrative Conference of the United States, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader the following question: This appears to be a very full schedule for next week, and I approve of the program that is outlined here wholeheartedly. From an analysis of this program, is there a high likelihood that there will be a session next Friday?

Mr. ALBERT. I should think there will be unless some change develops that I know nothing about at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am somewhat intrigued by the fact that there is not a single authorization bill nor an appropriation bill scheduled for next week. Of course, I understand that the continuing resolution providing for continuing appropriations is on the schedule. Is it intended to pass all the regular appropriation bills at this session of Congress—I mean before January 1, or will some of the regular appropriation bills be carried over into next year?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield further—

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. This continuing resolution is for 1 month. I, for one, am glad it is for 1 month. I think we need to proceed with the regular bills. I hope that the regular bills will all be passed before this continuing resolution runs out.

Certainly, the gentleman is on one of the committees and recognizes better than I the problems relating to getting out authorization bills. The gentleman's committee has one of the major authorization bills that is outstanding. All of the appropriation bills but one not requiring authorization have been passed by the House of Representatives but not by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I cannot let the gentleman from Oklahoma suggest that I am on one of the legislative committees that still has an authorization bill pending—I cannot let that go and pass by without some comment. The gentleman I am sure is aware of the fact that I am a member of the minority of that committee. I cannot move bills in and out of the committee.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman always underestimates his influence.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### GOVERNOR REAGAN ON TAX REFORM AND THE PROCEDURES OF CONGRESS

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, California's Gov. Ronald Reagan apparently does not like H.R. 13270, the tax reform bill overwhelmingly approved by the House last August 7. In a speech Tuesday night at Flint, Mich., Mr. Reagan asserted that the bill was "hatched in a back room, passed in the dark of night, and smuggled through the House."

He implied that the measure was somehow cooked up by the Johnson administration—"concocted in a back room by the staffs of a repudiated administration"—and he stated that the "flak and fallout" from the bill "threatens to drastically change the American economic system."

Even allowing for the license of a political party dinner, the Governor's words must sound strange indeed to millions of ordinary Americans to whom this bill would grant a long overdue measure of relief.

And they also must have a distinctly hollow ring for the members of our own Ways and Means Committee who labored so mightily to produce this historic legislation.

Rather than being "roared" through the Ways and Means Committee, as Mr. Reagan asserts in a rather peculiar choice of words, the bill was the carefully considered product of 30 days of public hearings and 38 days of executive sessions. Testimony was taken from 410 witnesses, surely a wide enough cross section to include even some of Mr. Reagan's friends.

The bill came to the House floor with the complete support of both the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee (Mr. MILLS), and the highly respected ranking minority member (Mr. BYRNES).

It was taken up under a rule providing 6 hours of debate, and was approved on a massive vote of 394 to 30. Evidently, few of Mr. Reagan's fellow Republicans in the House shared his disgust with the legislation, since they supported it even more preponderantly than the Democrats—176 to 10.

As for Mr. Reagan's contention that the measure was in some way foisted on the House by Johnson administration officials, the facts clearly speak otherwise.

A look at the legislative history of the bill indicates that, if anything, President Johnson was himself lukewarm about tax reform. In fact, the only reason the administration prepared reform proposals for submission to Congress was because it was ordered to under terms of an amendment to the 1968 Revenue and Expenditure Control Act. And, interestingly, the amendment, directing the administration to submit a reform plan by December 31, 1968, was drafted and introduced by a Republican, Senator JAVITS.

Mr. Reagan's contention that Johnson administration left-overs also were responsible for much of the staff work on the tax reform bill also lacks substance.

Besides drawing on the expertise of its own staff and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Ways and Means Committee was ably assisted by Edwin S. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for the Nixon administration, and some of Mr. Cohen's colleagues from the Treasury Department.

By unanimous consent, and in a sense of fairness, I shall insert Governor Reagan's full remarks in the RECORD:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOV. RONALD REAGAN—REPUBLICAN FUND-RAISING SPEECH FLINT, MICH., OCTOBER 21, 1969.

Governor Milliken and I share the challenge of being governors of large industrial

states. Most of our problems eventually get back to the matter of money. In this regard, Washington inevitably plays a major role. The federal government has preempted many of the sources of our income. To correct this, we are struggling to bring about some tax sharing.

Past administrations have also brought about an inflation of the currency which adds tremendous problems to the operation of a state government. But the current mischief causing us concern originated in the House of Representatives and is known as the Tax Reform Bill of 1969. It has been called the most revolutionary tax bill of our time. Tax Coordinator, a tax reporting publication, calls it "the most incredibly complicated tax law in United States history." In less formal circles it is known as the "Lawyers and Accountants Relief Act." This bill had its genesis in the surtax bill of 1968 sought by President Johnson to fight off the chickens of inflation which were coming home to roost.

The 1968 bill also required that the administration prepare a tax reform package for presentation to the 1969 Congress. The military would describe this as bobby trapping the position before withdrawal. With the inauguration of President Nixon, the Democratic leadership of Congress triggered the device.

What followed was unusual in the history of Congress. The most revolutionary tax reform bill of our time roared through the Ways and Means Committee, on to the floor of the House, and past the membership with virtually no advance notice or public hearing. The fiak and fallout threatens to drastically change the American economic system.

There is a lot of noble oratory about closing loopholes and the sound of the tumbrels can be heard carrying the venal rich to their jush punishment. Many of what our friends call loopholes are really the incentives which made the whole cockeyed tax structure work. Provisions for depletion, deductibility of gifts and tax free institutions were devices voted in by earlier congresses to promote worthwhile social objectives. Wasn't there a time when we felt that the discovery and production of raw materials was as important to our nation as the urban environment now? Are we no longer interested in supporting our schools and foundations? The booby trap has been extremely effective already.

Donations to private charities have ground to a halt since the passage of the House bill. Small colleges are threatened with extinction. Even such august institutions as the Institute for Advance Study at Princeton have publicly stated that their operations could be severely curtailed if the present bill is passed. Is this really in the best interest of our society, or is it simply another attempt by the bureaucrats to stifle anything but government owned and operated institutions? Is a man who gives away substantial sums of his invested capital every year using a gimmick, or is he benefiting society as was intended by the current tax law?

Of more direct concern to your governor and to me is the impending federal raid on municipal bond sales. The Bank of New York has accurately described the municipal bond market as "a disaster area in the finance world." Ever since House adoption of the current tax bill, interest rates on municipal bonds have sky-rocketed and sales have virtually stopped. In California our state water plan and needed campus facilities have been delayed because we cannot sell authorized bond issues.

And who gets the bill when municipalities and states must raise tax rates to compete in the commercial money market? The forgotten American—the low and middle income families whose property taxes will be raised once more to meet these increased borrowing costs.

And why should anyone have to be taxed for inflation? A man buys a house for \$10,000. The local tax collector one day has to tell this citizen that it's now valued at \$15,000—not because it's worth more but because dollars are worth less. If he sells his house for \$15,000, the government tells him he's made a \$5,000 profit even though he must pay \$15,000 for an exactly similar house. Government taxes 25 or 50 percent of what it has declared is profit and in truth he is the loser.

The real issue is a bill hatched in the back room, passed in the dark of night, and smuggled through the House. Shouldn't we start anew and ask some more basic questions?

I would like to suggest something I believe is in keeping with our Republican philosophy—a new bill of our own embodying a new basic principle, namely, a limit on government's power to tax. Surely the right to earn, keep and disburse should be as inalienable a right as the others listed in the first ten Amendments to the Constitution?

Dr. C. Northcote Parkinson, that great chronicler of the modern bureaucracy, has noted that the percentage of gross national product intercepted by the tax collector is an excellent barometer of the stability of civilizations. When all taxes, federal, state and local, absorb a significant portion of a society's gross national product, there is trouble. "At 35 percent there is a visible decline in freedom and stability," he wrote. "At 36 percent, there is disaster, complete and final, though not always immediate."

Today, 37 cents of every income dollar in the nation goes to taxes.

In this decade alone, total taxes for the average United States family are up 73 percent. The average family of four, with a wage earner who makes \$10,000 a year, has to pay \$2,600 in taxes . . . and he works three months just to earn the money to pay them . . . and he's not going to stand for it much longer.

Why not consider a limit on the power of all government to tax? And a distribution of these taxing powers between the federal, state and local levels in order to prevent the current preemption of the taxing power by the federal establishment. Those who are always rejecting what they charge are simplistic answers should be happy for the problems involved are complex. But history on the one hand, and the angry mood of the taxpayer on the other, confirm that our society will not remain stable upon attempting to increase taxes further.

Let us hope the Senate will carry out its traditional deliberative role for, we have a tax bill before us, concocted in a back room by staffs of a repudiated administration. What it slipped through in the dark of night does not stand the light of day. Under the false claim that it will benefit the system it would destroy, the current bill carries the seeds of destruction of local government, of private educational and charitable foundations, and of the basic concepts of a free enterprise system which has fought the most successful war on poverty in the history of man.

The President should examine it with care, for as Governor Milliken and I are both well aware, the power of veto is one of the major responsibilities of any chief executive.

#### DANIELS-MCGEE ACT OF 1969

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the date, Monday, October 20, 1969, marks what I believe to be a most significant event in the 49-year history of the Civil Service Retirement

system. It has the significance of assuring that the system will have the ability to fulfill its future obligations to millions of past, present, and future Federal employees and their families.

It is with a deep sense of pride and gratitude that I take this time to commend the President's action of October 20 in approving Public Law 91-93, the Civil Service Retirement Amendments of 1969, which will maintain confidence in the financial integrity of the program and contribute importantly toward the financial security of both the active and retired Federal work force.

Further, Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to be responsive to the widespread interest in its new and liberalized benefit provisions, I take this opportunity to present a series of questions and answers about the major changes made by this landmark legislation:

#### FINANCING THE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

1. Q. How is the financing of the system changed?

A. It is improved in three ways:

1. By an increase in retirement contributions so that they are sufficient to meet the normal cost of the system.

2. By authorization of appropriations to meet liabilities which result from future changes.

3. By authorizing the Treasury Department to pay interest on the existing unfunded liability of the system and for the cost of allowing credit for military service in computing annuities.

2. Q. How much will be deducted from an employee's pay as retirement contributions?

A. Seven percent of basic pay, instead of 6½ percent.

3. Q. When does this increased deduction begin?

A. The first pay period in 1970.

4. Q. Is the Government required to contribute to the retirement fund?

A. Yes, each Government agency matches the deductions from its employees' pay.

#### CREDIT FOR UNUSED SICK LEAVE

1. Q. In what kind of retirement cases may unused sick leave be added to the employee's service?

A. In two kinds:

1. Where the employee retires on an immediate annuity on or after October 20, 1969.

2. Where the employee dies on or after October 20, 1969 leaving a widow (or dependent widower) who is entitled to a survivor annuity.

2. Q. What is an immediate annuity?

A. One that begins no later than 1 month after separation from service. This would include an employee who retires at his own option, or who retires for age, disability, or because he was involuntarily separated without cause.

3. Q. How will credit for unused sick leave be allowed?

A. By adding the time represented by the unused sick leave to the retiring employee's actual service.

4. Q. For what purpose will unused sick leave be credited?

A. Only for counting the total number of years and months of service used in computing the amount of annuity.

5. Q. May unused sick leave be used for figuring the high average salary?

A. No.

6. Q. May unused sick leave be counted toward the minimum length of service necessary to retire or to qualify for a survivor annuity?

A. No.

7. Q. How much time credit is allowed for the unused sick leave?

A. Generally, each 8 hours of unused sick leave equals one day. Days are converted to months and years on a 260-day work year basis. On this basis, approximately 22 days equals 1 month.

8. Q. Is deposit of contributions to the retirement fund required to obtain retirement credit for unused sick leave?

A. No.

9. Q. Does the limitation on annuity of not more than 80 percent of the high average salary apply to annuity based on unused sick leave?

A. No. Additional annuity attributable to the sick leave credit is allowable over and above this limitation.

#### HIGH AVERAGE SALARY

1. Q. What change has been made in the average salary computation?

A. The "high-5" average salary formerly used in computing annuities is changed to "high-3". This is the largest annual rate resulting from averaging an employee's rates of basic pay in effect during any period of 3 consecutive years of civilian service, with each rate weighted by the time it was in effect.

2. Q. When does use of the high-3 average salary become effective?

A. It applies in the case of any employee who is separated from service on or after October 20, 1969.

3. Q. How is the high average salary figured if the employee has less than 3 years of service?

A. If an employee dies with between 18 months and 3 years of service and leaves survivors entitled to annuity (see following questions), his high average salary is figured over all his civilian service.

#### SURVIVOR ANNUITY—SPOUSE

1. Q. What change is there in the rights of widows?

A. The widow (or dependent widower) of an employee who dies on or after October 20, 1969, after as little as 18 months of civilian service is now entitled to survivor annuity. Formerly the minimum service requirement was 5 years.

2. Q. Must the minimum of 18 months be continuous service?

A. No. It may consist of 2 or more periods of service.

3. Are any of the other requirements for a widow's or widower's annuity changed?

A. All other requirements remain the same.

4. Q. How much survivor annuity is payable to a widow?

A. The 1969 Amendments guarantee a minimum annuity to the widow (or dependent widower) of an employee who dies on or after October 20, 1969. This amounts to 55 percent of the smaller of—

1. 40 percent of the deceased employee's high average salary, or

2. the regular annuity obtained after increasing the deceased employee's service by the period of time between his date of death and the date he would have reached age 60.

5. Q. Is this guaranteed minimum used in all cases?

A. It does not apply if the widow's annuity based on employee's actual service is more than the guaranteed minimum. In this instance, the widow's annuity is 55 percent of the annuity earned by the employee at the time of his death.

6. Q. In what situations will 55 percent of the earned annuity be more than the guaranteed minimum?

A. Whenever the deceased employee had sufficient service to produce a higher benefit. Also, since service cannot be projected beyond age 60 in any case, the guaranteed minimum is not operative where the employee dies after reaching that age.

7. Q. Was any change made in the benefit payable to the surviving spouse of a disability annuitant?

A. Yes. Formerly an employee who retired for disability could pass on to the surviving

wife or husband only 55 percent of his earned annuity, even though he received a higher benefit under the existing guaranteed minimum disability annuity provision. Now, for a disability annuitant who retires on or after October 20, 1969, the widow or widower will receive 55 percent of whatever annuity the retiree receives, unless the employee at retirement had specified a lesser benefit.

#### SURVIVOR ANNUITY—CHILD

1. Q. What change is there in the rights of children?

A. Each eligible child of an employee who dies on or after November 1, 1969, after as little as 18 months of civilian service is now entitled to survivor annuity. Formerly the minimum service requirement was 5 years.

2. Q. Need the minimum of 18 months be continuous service?

A. No. It may consist of 2 or more periods of service.

3. Q. Are any other requirements for a child's annuity changed?

A. No. All other requirements remain the same.

4. Q. How much survivor annuity is payable to a child?

A. The 1969 amendments increase annuity to a child. If the deceased employee is survived by a husband or wife, each eligible child will receive 60 percent of the employee's high average salary divided by the number of children. Annuity to any child is limited to \$900 a year, and the total to all children cannot be more than \$2,700 a year.

If no husband or wife survives the employee, each eligible child will receive 75 percent of the employee's high average salary divided by the number of children. Annuity to any one child is limited to \$1,080 a year, and the total to all children cannot be more than \$3,240 a year.

5. Q. Are all children entitled to survivor benefits eligible for the increased annuity?

A. Yes. These increased rates apply not only to children who qualify after this amendment is enacted, but also to children who are now receiving survivor annuity.

6. Q. When are these increases in children's annuities effective?

A. November 1, 1969. They will be reflected in the December 1, 1969 annuity checks which pay annuity for November.

#### REMARriage OF SURVIVING SPOUSE

1. Q. What effect does remarriage have on the survivor annuity of a widow or widower?

A. Basically, remarriage generally stops the survivor annuity. The new law permits continuance of survivor annuity, regardless of when the employee retired or died, if the widow or widower remarries (1) on or after July 18, 1966, and (2) after attaining age 60. Where such a remarriage has already occurred and the widow's or widower's annuity has been stopped, it will be resumed commencing October 20, 1969.

2. Q. If a widow's or widower's annuity is stopped because of remarriage, can it be resumed if the remarriage ends?

A. Yes, if (1) the remarriage occurred after July 18, 1966, (2) the widow or widower does not elect some other annuity which is acquired by reason of the remarriage, and (3) any lump sum retirement benefit paid is returned. Where a remarriage has already ended, the survivor annuity may be resumed effective October 20, 1969.

3. Q. If a widow's or widower's annuity has already stopped but the remarriage has ended, how can the annuity be resumed?

A. She or he must write to the Civil Service Commission giving full identifying information and full particulars about the remarriage and when and how it ended.

#### COST OF LIVING INCREASES

1. Q. Do the 1969 Amendments change the way cost-of-living increases in annuities are figured?

A. Yes. Cost-of-living annuity increases are still figured as formerly except that,

under the Amendments, 1 percent is added to each cost-of-living increase that is developed by the Consumer Price Index.

2. Q. Does the extra 1 percent affect the 4 percent cost-of-living increase that is already scheduled for November 1, 1969?

A. Yes, it changes this 4 percent increase to a 5 percent increase.

3. Q. Who will receive the 5 percent cost-of-living increase due November 1, 1969?

A. All retired employees and survivor annuitants whose annuities commenced November 1, 1969 or earlier.

4. Q. What is the last day an employee may retire from service and have his annuity commence November 1, 1969?

A. October 31, 1969. Employees in a pay status and separated after that date will not qualify for the 5 percent cost-of-living increase scheduled for November 1, 1969.

5. Q. Is there any advantage for an employee to retire on or before October 31, 1969?

A. If the employee retires between October 20 and 31, he will not only have his annuity figured under the 1969 Amendments but also have the 5 percent cost-of-living increase added to his annuity. However, the 1969 Amendment liberalizations—high average salary computation, unused sick leave credit, etc.—will apply equally to persons who retire after October.

6. Q. Will the extra 1 percent be added to future cost-of-living increases that are developed by the Consumer Price Index?

A. Yes.

#### EMPLOYEES PREVIOUSLY SEPARATED

1. Q. What is the effect of this amendment on those already separated from Federal service?

A. The provisions of this new law do not generally apply to those separated or retired before its effective date. However, annuitants already on the rolls will receive the extra 1 percent annuity increase.

2. Q. Do the provisions of the new law apply to retirees who have been reemployed by the Government?

A. Yes, under certain conditions. The age or optional retiree who is separated on or after October 20, 1969, and who has completed at least 1 year of continuous full-time civilian service as a reemployed annuitant will receive credit for any unused sick leave in determining his supplemental annuity. Should the retiree complete 5 years of such service, his annuity can be recomputed; in the recomputation, he will be eligible for all the benefits of the new law, i.e., sick leave credit, high average salary computation, and survivor benefits previously outlined.

#### COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY BILL

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at 4:40 this morning the body of the first of the coal miners who perished in the gassy grave of the Farmington, W. Va., disaster was recovered. Seventy-eight men were killed in the fiery explosions which rocked the No. 9 mine on November 20, 1968.

The Farmington disaster roused the conscience of the Nation to demand that action be taken to protect the health and safety of the coal miners. Although there have been no major disasters since Farmington, 182 coal miners have been killed and 5,465 injured since that terrible morning last November.

Mr. Speaker, the coal operators of this Nation have been lobbying to weaken the

October 23, 1969

health and safety legislation which Congress will start considering soon. The National Coal Association has written a letter to every Member of Congress which threatens Congress with power shortages if we try too hard to protect coal miners. The letter, dated October 21, states bluntly:

If Congress enacts a bill which closes many coal mines it will jeopardize the public welfare by bringing on a nationwide power and steel shortage. . . . If Congress forces the closing of coal mines, a serious shortage can become critical and the nation will face power blackouts.

Mr. Speaker, there is talk of compromise in the air. There are many who would water down and compromise this bill. Death is a very certain phenomenon, Mr. Speaker. How can we compromise on an issue like that? Can you compromise on a man's life, limbs, and lungs? The coal operators shed tears and spread fears that coal mines will be closed down. Would you rather close down a mine or close down a man?

As the widows of Farmington wait patiently for the recovery of the bodies of their husbands who perished at Farmington, let us in Congress rise to the challenge and enact a strong, meaningful, effective coal mine health and safety bill without compromise with coal miners' lives. The slaughter in the coal mines must stop.

#### ROGERS INTRODUCES 3-YEAR EXTENSION OF REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAM

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to extend and expand the regional medical programs for 3 fiscal years. The present authorizing legislation expires on June 30, 1969.

The basic structure of the regional medical program is to provide for education, research, training, and demonstrations in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases.

The bill that I am introducing would not change the basic purpose of this law, but would expand the field of activity to include other major diseases and conditions as well as heart disease, cancer, and stroke. This would enable a regional medical program to operate from a broader base and to work with such medical problems as arthritis and trauma.

Eventually, as the regional medical program continues to expand its scope of operation in providing up-to-date medical knowledge to the practitioners and providers of health care, the categorical emphasis of the program should be eliminated and the program properly coordinated with comprehensive health planning.

A basic purpose of the regional medical program is to afford the medical profession and the medical institutions the opportunity of making available to their patients the latest advances in the diagnosis and treatment of these diseases.

The bill that I am introducing would expand this purpose to include prevention from these diseases and rehabilitation of those stricken with the disease.

I believe that this proposed change in the law will enable the regional medical programs to more fully carry out the intent of the original legislation by providing more extensive and current knowledge about these diseases and conditions to the providers of health care.

In addition, the bill that I am introducing would provide for the inclusion of representatives from official health and health planning agencies on the advisory group for the operation of the local regional medical programs. Under present law only representatives from voluntary health agencies are permitted to serve on such advisory boards and I believe that the program will benefit from having these official groups on the advisory boards at the local level.

Another change that I am proposing in the bill I am introducing would permit consideration of all regional medical program projects at the local level by the 314(b) comprehensive areawide health planning agencies established under the Partnership for Health Act, Public Law 89-749. This change in the basic law, I believe, will contribute to a more effective regional medical program and will better insure that consumer participation at the local level is meaningful.

I believe, too, that this change in the basic law would be consistent with the direction being taken by the national advisory council on regional medical programs. At its February 1969 meeting that council issued a policy directive which required that where applications for regional medical program projects include requests for the purchase of major patient care equipment, adequate evidence must be included to show that the project plan has been reviewed and, if necessary, approved by the appropriate local planning agency. And, in Memphis, Tenn., the regional medical program and the local 314(b) agency share the same advisory board and geographical area.

Moreover, I feel that by maximizing appropriate coordination at the local level, one of my principal concerns regarding the regional medical programs will be eased. During hearings last year on the 2-year extension of the law, I expressed concern that this program in too many instances was stopping at the university dean's office, rather than reaching the providers of health care, and the practicing physicians and community hospitals within a given region were not effectively receiving the most recent information on these diseases.

I realize that the regional medical program is still in its infancy, but I believe that increased coordination will be realized through utilization of the 314(b) agencies and that we will be making better utilization of our resources under this most worthwhile program.

A corollary to the provision in the bill which would permit review by the 314(b) agency is the question of decategorization of the regional medical program. At its inception, the regional medical pro-

gram had categorical emphasis and this has been supported for the most part by the medical community, the medical schools and the major voluntary associations interested in the specific diseases at which the program was aimed.

As the regional medical program has entered the operational phases, it has become more broadly defined through interpretation and implementation. However, I do not believe we should abruptly decategorize the regional medical program, but rather should move gradually toward decategorization through a broadening of purpose of the program and through closer coordination with the 314(b) agencies. The bill that I am introducing today will, I believe, assist in attaining this objective.

Mr. Speaker, to date 55 regions of the regional medical program have been organized, and 44 of these have received operational grants reaching 75 percent of the Nation's population. Another six regional programs should enter their operational phase by the end of this year.

To date, for the 4 fiscal years the regional medical program has been in effect, more than \$114 million has been distributed to the 55 designated regions for planning or operation.

At present, approximately 75 percent of the population of this Nation is located in regions which have received operational grants, and by the end of the present fiscal year, it is anticipated that almost all of the population will be covered by regions with operation grants.

State hospital associations in all of the 50 States participate in the program; all State health departments plus those in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico participate in the program and more than 2,000 persons representing the medical and health resources of the regions serving on the regional advisory groups which provide advice to the grantee in the planning and operational program and which must approve an application for an operational grant.

I believe the regional medical program is coming of age, and I am hopeful that early hearings on this legislation can be held in order to permit a determination on the proper direction for the program in the future.

#### WILSON APPLAUDS CHANGE IN ADMINISTRATION DRUG APPROACH

(Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been calling for a more realistic approach to the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem. I hope that my statements in this area have played some small role in providing information and presenting various opinions that resulted in the change in administration policies regarding penalties for possession of drugs. I commend President Nixon and Attorney General Mitchell for heeding the advice of not only concerned Members



October 21, 1969

D 967

## OUR NATION AND THE SEA—NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC AGENCY

*Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:* Subcommittee on Oceanography continued hearings on the report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources entitled "Our Nation and the Sea," and on H.R. 13247, to establish a National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency. Testimony was heard from Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President.

## MARITIME ACADEMY ACT

*Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:* Subcommittee on Maritime Education and Training began hearings on H.R. 8328 and related bills, to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958, to require repayment of amounts paid for the training of merchant marine officers who do not serve in the merchant marine or Armed Forces; and H.R. 8785, to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958, to increase the amount of assistance to such academies and to provide a minimum subsistence payable per student. Testimony was heard from Rear Adm. Edward J. O'Donnell, New York State Maritime College; Milton Nottingham, legislative representative, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Alumni; Capt. Thomas Burke, vice president, Maritime Alumni Associations; and a representative of the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

## POSTAL REFORM

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:* Met in executive session for continued consideration of postal reform.

Committee to continue Thursday, October 23.

## BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT

*Committee on Rules:* Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of, and 5 hours of debate, making in order committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment on, H.R. 6778, to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. Testimony was heard from Representatives Patman, Widnall, Moorhead, Stanton, and Brown of Michigan.

## MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

*Committee on Rules:* Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of, and 4 hours of debate on, H.R. 14001, to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, to authorize modifications of the system of selecting persons for induction into the armed services under this act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Hébert, Pirnie, Ichord, Horton, Pike, Nedzi, Bennett, Leggett, Thompson of New Jersey, and Ottinger.

## LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION

*Committee on Rules:* Special Subcommittee on Legislative Reorganization met for a final briefing session con-

ducted by Walter Kravitz of the Legislative Reference Service. The briefing was on the work of the committee thus far. Public hearings are scheduled to begin Thursday, October 23.

## SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Continued hearings on proposals to amend the various titles of the Social Security Act. Testimony was heard from Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert H. Finch.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

## Joint Committee Meetings

### APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

*Conferees,* in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on S. 1072, authorizing funds for Appalachian regional development and other regional development programs.

## BILL SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

### New Law

(For last listing of public laws, see DIGEST, p. D961, October 20, 1969)

H.R. 9825, to revise retirement financing and benefits for Government employees and Members of Congress. Signed October 20, 1969 (P.L. 91-93).

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

### Senate

*Committee on Appropriations,* subcommittee, to continue hearings on H.R. 13111, fiscal 1970 appropriations for Labor—HEW, 10:30 a.m. and 2 p.m., room S-128, Capitol.

*Committee on Banking and Currency,* executive, on H.R. 2, to establish a National Credit Union Administration; S. 2577, to provide additional mortgage credit; and S. 823, re fair credit reporting, 10 a.m., 5302 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Commerce,* executive, on pending nominations, 9:30 a.m., 5112 New Senate Office Building.

*Communications Subcommittee,* to continue hearings on S. 2876, to amend the Communications Act with regard to political broadcasting, 9 a.m., 5110 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Finance,* to receive testimony regarding taxation of foundations, 10 a.m., 2219 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Foreign Relations,* Subcommittee on U.S. Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad, to continue executive hearings on personnel facilities and programs in Laos, to hear witnesses of the executive branch of Government, 10 a.m., room S-116, Capitol.

*Committee on Government Operations,* Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to resume hearings on alleged mismanagement of military service clubs, to hear Gen. Carl C. Turner, and others, 10 a.m., 3302 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,* Subcommittee on Health, to continue hearings on S. 2660, authorizing funds to extend the Migrant Health Act, 10 a.m., 4232 New Senate Office Building.

*Next meeting of the* **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
12:00 noon, Wednesday, October 22

Subcommittee No. 5, Antitrust, to continue hearings on conglomerate mergers, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn House Office Building.

*Committee on Merchant Marine, Subcommittee on Maritime Education and Training, to continue hearings on H.R. 8328 and related bills, to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to require repayment of amounts paid for the training of merchant marine officers who do not serve in the merchant marine or Armed Forces; and H.R. 8785, to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to increase the amount of assistance to such academies and to provide a minimum subsistence payable per student, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth House Office Building.*

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service*, Subcommittee on Postal Rates, to continue hearings on H.R. 10877, proposed postal rate increases, 10 a.m., 112 Cannon House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Postal Operations, to continue hearings on obscene mail matter, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Position Classification, to continue hearings on H.R. 13008, Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1969, 10 a.m., 219 Cannon House Office Building.

*Committee on Standards of Official Conduct*, executive, on pending business, 2 p.m., 2360 Rayburn House Office Building.

*Committee on Ways and Means*, to continue hearings on proposals to amend the various titles of the Social Security Act, 10 a.m., committee room, Longworth House Office Building.

## Joint Committees

*Joint Economic Committee, Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, to resume hearings on "The Federal Budget, Inflation, and Full Employment, 1970-75," to hear Agriculture Secretary Hardin, and others, 10 a.m., room S-407, Capitol.*

*Conferees, executive, on H.R. 11612, fiscal 1970 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and related agencies, 10 a.m., room S-228, Capitol.*

*Committee on the Judiciary*, Subcommittee No. 2, to hold hearing on H.R. 14119, to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate mandatory submission for approval by the Attorney General of the title to lands acquired for or on behalf of the United States, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn House Office Building.

Nichols, Bill, Ala., E8664  
 Ottinger, Richard L., N.Y., E8670  
 Pepper, Claude, Fla., E8671  
 Pucinski, Roman C., Ill., E8678  
 Purcell, Graham, Tex., E8672  
 Rooney, John J., N.Y., E8678  
 Rosenthal, Benjamin S., N.Y., E8674  
 Roudelush, Richard L., Ind., E8661  
 Saylor, John P., Pa., E8674  
 Teague, Olin E., Tex., E8676, E8679, E8680  
 Thompson, Frank, Jr., N.J., E8655, E8666  
 Widnall, William B., N.J., E8676  
 Wold, John, Wyo., E8655  
 Wyatt, Wendell, Ore., E8660  
 Wydlar, John W., N.Y., E8661

Metcalf, Lee, Mont., E8655, E8659  
Randolph, Jennings, W. Va., E8656  
Thurmond, Strom, S.C., E8656

Andrews, Mark, N. Dak., E8664  
Boland, Edward P., Mass., E8659  
Bray, William G., Ind., E8666  
Collins, James M., Tex., E8669  
Conte, Silvio O., Mass., E8661



# Congressional Record

appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for \$1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.